

Subject: Re: 8 and 9 January 2013 emails

From: John <jlayte@tiscali.co.uk>

Date: 10/01/2013 10:53

To: Chris STRICKLAND 13782 <Christopher.STRICKLAND@devonandcornwall.pnn.police.uk>

CC: Peter.SIMMS@devonandcornwall.pnn.police.uk, Exeter Court

<enquiries@exeter.countycourt.gsi.gov.uk>,

professionalstandards@devonandcornwall.pnn.police.uk, Michael Stamp

<michael.stamp@devonandcornwall.pnn.police.uk>, Chief Constable

<shaun.sawyer@devonandcornwall.pnn.police.uk>,

emma.webber@devonandcornwall.pnn.police.uk,

Peter.JONES@devonandcornwall.pnn.police.uk, David Cameron

<privateoffice@no10.x.gsi.gov.uk>, Jonathan Djanogly <jonathan.djanogly.mp@parliament.uk>,

"Sarah Newton (MP)" <Sarah.Newton.MP@parliament.uk>, "EUSTICE, George"

<george.eustice.mp@parliament.uk>, Theresa May Home Secretary

<privateoffice.external@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk>, northcasework@ipcc.gsi.gov.uk,

enquiries@ipcc.gsi.gov.uk, Private Eye <strokes@private-eye.co.uk>,

opcc@devonandcornwall.pnn.police.uk, Paul.CHUDLEY@devonandcornwall.pnn.police.uk,

Nalders <Contact@nalders.co.uk>, Nick Clegg <psdpm@cabinet-office.x.gsi.gov.uk>, DJ Arthur

<info@dishonestjudges.org.uk>, The Arthurs <natasha@austin-uk.co.uk>, Mr and Mrs Arthur

<traderenquiries@poolmarket.biz>, Danny Everard <lbdeco@hotmail.co.uk>, "The Guardian

(Owen Bowcott)" <owen.bowcott@guardian.co.uk>, The Daily Telegraph

<dtnews@telegraph.co.uk>, Police General Enquires <101@devonandcornwall.pnn.police.uk>,

JL <johnlayte@gmail.com>, Kath Layte <kath@layte.com>

For the attn of Detective Inspector C.Strickland 13782 Devon & Cornwall Constabulary

Dear Mr Strickland

I would be grateful if you would acknowledge receipt of the 8 (below) and 9 January 2013 emails.

It is noted that you returned as "unread" three emails previous to these. One of them requested that the recipients confirm they had looked at the DVD and the arthur-v-layte.co.uk web site provided to you in our 30 July 2010 letter but of course if you didn't read the email you won't know that.

I attach a copy of your 17 November 2010 reply to our 30 July 2010 letter in which you say you have submitted the "paperwork" to your Force Legal Department. You will recall that my 20 November 2010 email (attached as part of Strickland 22 Nov reply) questioned whether or not the term "paperwork" included the DVD and you had submitted the DVD to your Force Legal Department. Your 22 November 2010 reply (attached) confirmed that you had submitted a copy of the DVD to your Legal Department.

Despite the fact that you have already confirmed you submitted the DVD to your Legal Department I would be grateful if you would ratify that in writing and you see to it that your Force Legal Department responds to the parts of my 21 December 2012 email (below and attached) relevant to them which are (a) (b) (c) (d) (e) (f) (g) (h) and (i).

Yours sincerely

JH Layte

On 08/01/2013 11:09, john layte (co.uk) wrote:

Dear Mr Simms

Thank you for your 6 January 2012 (21:31) email.

Your claim in your email that you "[have not to date received a reply to the email below \(sent 19 December 2012\)](#)" is untrue since I replied to it on 21 December 2012. By way of proof I attach (and reproduce a copy below) of my reply. You should be aware that the Police and the Court confirmed receipt of it at the time (see attached) so I find it surprising that they received a copy and you did not. You will note that the last paragraph of my 21 December 2012 email deals with your brief regarding DS Pengelly and I have nothing further to add other than it is my belief you would be wasting everyone's time and money to proceed with "your brief" and if you do then you will be subject to a complaint from me for wasting public money. The remainder of my 21 December 2012 is much more important and a response is required to items (a) to (l) from the appropriate recipient without further delay. I confirm I have not had a response from the Police, the Police Legal Department or the Court to date.

Attached to my 21 December 2012 email was a .pdf copy of it which differed from the main body text only in that some documents mentioned linked directly to copies uploaded to the Internet. I attach another copy with links ([21dec2012tosimms with links.pdf](#)) to this email.

You will see from looking at the [21dec2012tosimms with links.pdf](#) file (attached) that I have uploaded a copy of the July 2010 DVD to the Internet (since then more copies of the DVD have been uploaded to other domains and several more copies of the arthur-v-layte.co.uk site have also been uploaded to different domains).

A copy of the July 2010 DVD was posted with our 30 July 2010 letter to DI Strickland (attached) and the letter (+ DVD) was also posted, amongst others, to the Court and Mr Arthur by recorded delivery and both signed for it (see page 5 of the copy arthur-v-layte web site to see all recipients and which of them signed for the letter or acknowledged receipt / did not acknowledge receipt of it).

The letter and the DVD both mention the arthur-v-layte.co.uk web site and it is our belief that the DVD and the web site contain evidence against Mr Arthur that can accurately be described as "beyond all reasonable doubt".

There is no doubt whatsoever that Mr Arthur was responsible for the closure of the

arthur-v-layte.co.uk in November 2010 whilst the Police were investigating him for alleged perverting the course of Justice and there is no doubt whatsoever that the web site contained evidence of this. Surely closing down a web site that contained evidence against the person responsible for closing it is itself a blatant attempt to pervert the course of Justice by "attempting to hide or destroy evidence that the perpetrator is aware has been supplied to the Police". An investigation into this crime has been promised by the Police since November 2012 but I have heard nothing to date.

Regarding other points made in your 6 January 2012 21:31 email.

I confirm I asked for a call back from you on or about 4 January 2013 but have not received one to date. (For the record I confirm I also asked for a call back from DS Emma Webber (Head of PSD) on or about 3 January 2013 but have not received one to date. I wished to talk with her regarding the 20 December 2012 letter I received (thought to be authored by her but not signed by her) before publishing a response to it on the Internet.

I confirm that most phone calls to and from my home telephone number are recorded and I have many hundreds of hours of conversations with the Police, the PSD, the IPCC and others concerning this case. It is obviously possible for me to upload them to the internet but I confirm I have not done so to date. I note you make no objection to my uploading recorded phone calls to the Internet and take your email to be confirmation that the Police have no objection if I do.

I note you require communications in writing "[in order that we are all clear as to what has been communicated](#)". This communication is in writing and "[I hope you understand this](#)" and a response is required.

Thank you for revealing Mr Jones' email address. He declined to give it to me himself. Future emails will be addressed to him personally and not to the PSD in the hope that they forward my email to him. You will recall that Mr Chudley (PSD) claimed the PSD did not forward him a copy of my 2 February 2011 email (attached) despite written proof from the IPCC and the Police authority that they forwarded it to the PSD.

There are no "previously investigated matters" to re-open. There are several that have not been investigated properly (or at all) and thus have not yet been opened (or closed!).

Regarding my 2 February 2011 email (attached).

It should be obvious that this email is not a complaint regarding misconduct of a particular Police officer (other than DC Exelby) and should not have been treated as such by the PSD. The second paragraph states "[I do not agree with any of the content of the letter](#)" This is the main point of the email and It has not yet been addressed by the Police or the PSD nearly two years later. The "[letter](#)" concerned is the letter received on 26 January 2011 (attached).

On receipt of the 26 January 2011 letter (attached) it was not clear if the content reflected the private view of DI Strickland (it was not on Police paper and was signed C.Strickland with no rank or number) or was the official view of Devon & Cornwall Constabulary / Legal Department.

It took the Police over a year (your (DI Simms) 24 April 2012 report) to admit that the 26 January 2011 letter was drafted by the Force Legal Department and thus the views expressed in the letter represent the official Police views as opposed to the private view of Mr Strickland. That being the case I strongly disagree with the official Police views expressed in the letter, such as -

1. That there is no evidence that Mr Arthur perverted the course of Justice. (The DVD and the arthur-v-layte.co.uk web site both contain irrefutable evidence that he did. The Police refuse to confirm whether or not they looked at either).
2. That Mr Arthur did not know what was in the envelope served on 7 January 2009. (The Judge at the 30 December 2008 Hearing Ordered that I serve and file my bill of costs by this date. Mr Arthur attended the Hearing. The envelope was delivered by hand to Mr & Mrs Arthur's service address for hand delivered documents. The envelope was very securely sealed. There was no indication on the outside of the envelope as to who had delivered it. If Mr Arthur did not know what was in it then how was he able to return it (unopened) by post to me if he did not know what was in it and there was no indication on the outside of the sealed envelope as to who had delivered it?).
3. That DC Exelby has no links with Mr Arthur. (DC Exelby does have links with Mr Arthur so why did he deny it? The complaint against DC Exelby dates back to 2004 (see 271 pages of Police / IPCC correspondence regarding this on the DVD). The Police say it has been dealt with. If this were true than a report would have resulted. Will the Police please prove the complaint against DC Exelby has been dealt with by providing me with a contemporaneous report and confirmation that I was made aware of it at the time.

Regarding Mr Chudley's denial that he received a copy my 2 February 2011 email (attached)

There is no doubt whatsoever that the IPCC and the Police Authority forwarded a copy of this email to the PSD but nearly a year after this Mr Chudley (PSD), in a phone call, denied all knowledge of it. Mr Chudley refused to put this denial in writing which necessitated a complaint being made against him on 24 March 2012. The IPCC acknowledged this complaint by letter dated 9 May 2012 but to date the Police / PSD have declined to record or deal with this complaint against Mr Chudley. The IPCC have told me that a complaint against a member of the PSD has to be recorded by the head of the Devon & Cornwall PSD (or referred to the PSD of another Police force). Both the former head of the PSD (I Grafton MBE) and the current head (E Webber) have failed to record the complaint against Mr Chudley to date and this is unacceptable. Members of the PSD (Professional Standards Department) MUST tell the truth and it is obvious that Mr Chudley does not.

It should be noted that if the Police / PSD / Mr Chudley had dealt with my 2 February 2011 email when it was sent and for what it was rather than over a year later try and break it down into what it wasn't (complaint(s) of misconduct) this case would have been resolved two years ago. The Default Costs Certificates that Mr Arthur managed to get set aside by providing false evidence to the Court would have been re-instated and our costs would have been paid. It should be noted that interest on our costs (Mr & Mrs Arthur's debt) is accruing at about £28,000 per annum which means that Mr Chudley is responsible for about £56,000 of it to date.

The disagreement between with the Police.

This is quite simple. The Police describe the evidence we provided against Mr Arthur as sufficient only "on the balance of probabilities (50%+)" to prove that he perverted the course of Justice. On the other hand we say there is evidence on the DVD and the arthur-v-layte.co.uk web site to prove "beyond all reasonable doubt (near 100%)" that he perverted the course of Justice and the problem is the Police's reluctance (current refusal) to look at this evidence. Furthermore we believe there is evidence on the DVD that Mr Arthur committed other crimes in the course of this litigation such as the ones listed (a) to (k) on pages 7 and 8 of our 30 July 2010 letter (attached).

It is essential that the Police stop playing ostrich, remove their head from the sand and have a comprehensive look at the July 2010 DVD and the (copy) arthur-v-layte.co.uk web site (the Police have been told the address of several copy sites). When they have done so they MUST confirm they have looked at the DVD and the web site, list exactly what documents they have looked at and then state in writing that it is their genuine opinion that "there is no evidence that Mr Arthur perverted the course of Justice" and "Mr Arthur didn't know what was in the envelope served on 7 January 2009" and "there is no evidence that Mr Arthur committed any of the crimes (a) to (k) listed on pages 7 and 8 of our 30 July 2010 letter (attached)".

It is time the Police dealt with the main issue here instead of wasting everybody's time and money by "dealing" with alleged complaints of misconduct which are unimportant and have no bearing on the main issue.

To repeat what is stated in paragraph two above. "Will the Police, the Police Legal Department and the Court please respond to items (a) to (l) of my 21 December 2012 email without further delay or excuse".

If the Police have lost their copy of the July 2010 DVD (photo of cover attached) then please request another otherwise it will be taken that they have not lost it and are just ignoring it.

The longer this nonsense continues the more it will cost the Police, the Court and Mr Arthur in money and reputation and (in your own words Mr Simms) "I hope you understand this".

Yours sincerely

JH Layte

----- Original Message -----

Subject:FW: complaint against police NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Date:Sun, 6 Jan 2013 21:31:23 +0000

From:<Peter.SIMMS@devonandcornwall.pnn.police.uk>

To:'john@layte.com' <john@layte.com>

CC:JONES Peter 54589 <Peter.JONES@devonandcornwall.pnn.police.uk>

Hello Mr Layte,

Following New Year leave I returned to the office and have picked up your answerphone message.

I note you were asking for a call back.

However, I have not to date received a reply to the e-mail below which is a necessary step in the process.

At this stage I am asking for an acknowledgement that you understand that I will investigate the matters detailed.

I know from my previous dealings with you that you are passionate in your desire for previously investigated matters to be reopened and because of this my organisation needs to make it clear that unless there are new matters that I will be looking at those detailed only at this stage.

I am also aware that our call will be recorded and in part uploaded to the internet. For this reason I wish to have all of our communications recorded in written form in order that we are all clear as to what has been communicated.

I hope you understand this.

My investigation as regards the matters you have complained of, and I've been directed to investigate is almost complete and I would hope to conclude this and answer your points to your satisfaction shortly.

thanks

DI Pete Simms

West Cornwall Local Investigation

Tel (01736) 356261

internal x6261

e-mail peter.simms@devonandcornwall.pnn.police.uk

From: SIMMS Peter 13321

Sent: 19 December 2012 14:02

To: 'john@layte.com'

Subject: complaint against police NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Mr Layte,

thanks for confirming your e-mail address, I hope you are well. I have been directed to investigate the below complaint on your behalf, mainly I believe, because I know some of the background.

I am aware that you are unhappy with a large number of issues and that your complaints in their entirety are complex, have been in process for a number of years and have included more officers in the course of their progress.

I also anticipate because of my prior knowledge that you may be unhappy that I will be looking at this issue in the text below specifically and no others at this stage. I know the separation of issues has caused you certain dissatisfaction in the past. However, this is my brief and this is what I will look into.

It is my intention to contact the force solicitors office and clarify:

1. Whether the facts as stated are correct
2. Whether this was the advice passed to DS Pengelly

I will then ask DS Pengelly for comment and during this process and at its conclusion report the facts back to you.

Please advise me if there are any other facets of this specific complaint that you would have me be aware of.

Thanks.

COMPLAINT AGAINST POLICE

File reference number: **PSD/CO/184/12**

Complainant: **Mr John Layte**

Subject (Officer / Staff): **DS 3364 Pengelly**

Assessment: For Local Investigation

Précis of allegation(s):

Alleged that officer has not been truthful when telling the complainant that he has told by Force Legal that "A Judge cannot commit perjury because he/she is not under oath"

DI Pete Simms

West Cornwall Local Investigation

Tel (01736) 356261

internal x6261

e-mail peter.simms@devonandcornwall.pnn.police.uk

On 21/12/2012 16:29, John wrote:

----- Original Message -----

Subject:Re: complaint against police (NOT)

Date:Fri, 21 Dec 2012 16:29:03 +0000

From:John <jlajte@tiscali.co.uk>

To:Peter.SIMMS@devonandcornwall.pnn.police.uk, Exeter Court
<enquiries@exeter.countycourt.gsi.gov.uk>,

professionalstandards@devonandcornwall.pnn.police.uk, Michael Stamp
<michael.stamp@devonandcornwall.pnn.police.uk>

CC:JL <johnlayte@gmail.com>, Kath Layte <kath@layte.com>

Mr Simms

A .PDF copy of this email with live links is attached for your convenience. I will be forwarding a copy of this email to at least the same addressees as on my 19 December 2012 email (attached) in due course.

Regards and Merry Christmas

JH Layte

Goonhillend, Goongumpas, St Day, Cornwall, TR16 5JL

01209 820146 john@layte.com

21 December 2012

Devon & Cornwall Constabulary
Exeter County Court

Dear Mr Simms

Thank you for your email.

I confirm I have prepared a reply and am ready to email it to you and also post the letter to Mr Jones (PSD) mentioned in my 19 December 2012 email (attached) but I have not as yet received the confirmation requested in my 19 December 2012 as below.

In the meantime will the Police **and the Court** please confirm they have a copy of the DVD enclosed with our 30 July 2010 letter to DI Strickland (copied to the Court, Mr Arthur and others). A photo of the DVD is attached for your convenience and I am aware that many other versions have been provided to the Court and the Police (and Mr Arthur!) but this is the one that I think most relevant to the current issues. Mr Arthur has recently been provided with the address of a newly uploaded web site that is an almost exact copy of this DVD and I am sure he will let the Police know the address if they ask him.

Before this matter proceeds it is essential that the **Police and the Court** confirm –

- (a) They received the DVD posted to them in July 2010 enclosed with our 30 July 2010 letter to DI Strickland.
- (b) They are still in possession of a copy of the DVD.

The **Police Legal Department** confirm -

- (c) DI Strickland sent them a copy of the DVD.
- (d) They considered the data on the DVD before drafting the 26 January 2011 letter (previously attributed to DI Strickland) and –
- (e) In particular they considered the DVD data held under “11 Post Trial Chronology” before drafting the 26 January 2011 letter (attached).
- (f) They confirm they stand by (what is now known to be) **their** assertion that there is no evidence that Mr Arthur Perverted the course of Justice regarding what they falsely claim in their 26 January 2011 letter to be the “first” time I served my bill.
- (g) They really believe that “Mr Arthur didn’t know what was in the envelope” containing what they wrongly call “my second bill of costs” in their 26 January 2011 letter. It should be noted the Court had ordered me to serve and file my bill by the date it was delivered and Mr Arthur returned it by post unopened to my postal address yet there was no indication on the envelope as to who had delivered it.
- (h) It is their view that perverting the course of Justice is a Civil matter if perpetrated within Civil proceedings.
- (i) It is their view that Judges have no obligation to tell the truth in Court because “they are not under oath”.
- (j) It is their view that His Honour Judge Griggs’ and Mr Jonathon Djanogly’s statements “that I did not comply with Judge Wainwright’s September 2007 Order are truthful.

The **Court** confirm –

- (k) They are aware that Mrs Deery of Exeter Court stated in her 5 February 2010 letter “*The District Judge (DJ Wainwright) confirmed that the consequence of the order of His Honour Judge Griggs on 14 July 2009 was that unless and until Mr and/or Mrs Layte successfully appeal that order, any consequential directions relating to the costs bills must fall*”
- (l) They were in possession of a copy of the 23 December 2009 letter from the Court of Appeal (attached) at the time Mrs Deery wrote her 5 February 2010 letter.

It goes without saying I think it far far more important that the above questions are answered before you

waste more time and money and proceed with your brief and report on whether or not DS Pengelly was telling the truth as regards what he says the Force Legal Department told him "A Judge cannot commit perjury because he/she is not under oath". For the record I believe he was telling the truth and it is the Force Legal Department that was not.

Yours sincerely

JH Layte

On 19/12/2012 14:02, Peter.SIMMS@devonandcornwall.pnn.police.uk wrote:

Mr Layte,

thanks for confirming your e-mail address, I hope you are well. I have been directed to investigate the below complaint on your behalf, mainly I believe, because I know some of the background.

I am aware that you are unhappy with a large number of issues and that your complaints in their entirety are complex, have been in process for a number of years and have included more officers in the course of their progress.

I also anticipate because of my prior knowledge that you may be unhappy that I will be looking at this issue in the text below specifically and no others at this stage. I know the separation of issues has caused you certain dissatisfaction in the past. However, this is my brief and this is what I will look into.

It is my intention to contact the force solicitors office and clarify:

1. Whether the facts as stated are correct
2. Whether this was the advice passed to DS Pengelly

I will then ask DS Pengelly for comment and during this process and at its conclusion report the facts back to you.

Please advise me if there are any other facets of this specific complaint that you would have me be aware of.

Thanks.

COMPLAINT AGAINST POLICE

File reference number: **PSD/CO/184/12**

Complainant: **Mr John Layte**

Subject (Officer / Staff): **DS 3364 Pengelly**

Assessment: For Local Investigation

Précis of allegation(s):

Alleged that officer has not been truthful when telling the complainant that he has told by Force Legal that "A Judge cannot commit perjury because he/she is not under oath"

DI Pete Simms

West Cornwall Local Investigation
Tel (01736) 356261
internal x6261
e-mail peter.simms@devonandcornwall.pnn.police.uk

101 - The new non emergency number for Devon and Cornwall Police
Textphone 18001 101 for the deaf, hard of hearing or speech impaired
Always call 999 in an emergency

Devon and Cornwall Police aims to serve the communities of Devon and Cornwall and help inspire greater confidence in the Police. For more information please visit our website at www.devon-cornwall.police.uk

This e-mail is intended for the named individual(s) only and may contain information which is protected in law. If you have received this e-mail in error, you may not read, copy, disseminate or otherwise deal with it. In this case, please delete the e-mail and contact the sender immediately.

Internet e-mail is not secure. Therefore Devon and Cornwall Police does not accept legal responsibility for the contents or distribution of this message including file attachments. Any views or opinions presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Devon and Cornwall Police. All reasonable efforts have been made to check that any attached software or other material is free of computer viruses, but Devon and Cornwall Police accepts no responsibility for any damage, howsoever arising, as a result of their transmission to the recipient's computer or network.

No virus found in this message.
Checked by AVG - www.avg.com
Version: 2013.0.2805 / Virus Database: 2637/5968 - Release Date: 12/18/12

—Strickland 22 Nov reply to 20 Nov 2010 email.eml—

Subject: Fwd: Your 17 November 2010 letter. NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED
From: John Layte <johnlayte@gmail.com>
Date: 10/01/2013 09:46
To: john@layte.com

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **john layte** <johnlayte@googlemail.com>
Date: 23 November 2010 01:21
Subject: Re: Your 17 November 2010 letter. NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED
To: 13782 <Christopher.STRICKLAND@devonandcornwall.pnn.police.uk>
Cc: PolAuth@devonandcornwall.pnn.police.uk, johnlayte@hotmail.com,
kath@kathlayte.freeseerve.co.uk

Mr STRICKLAND

Thank you for that information and we look forward to your full and comprehensive report on your investigation into our complaint against Mr Arthur which should run into several hundred pages as it has taken you over five months to produce it so far. There are at least 11 more complaints against Mr Arthur to follow as you know from our July 2010 letter. That is over four years worth of complaints to deal with if the others take you as long to investigate as this one.

You say you will be in contact "by the end of the week" but we have heard that several times before. Today is Tuesday.

Please forward this e-mail to your Force Legal Department and confirm to both of us you have done so. (kath@kathlayte.freeseerve.co.uk is the e-mail address of K Layte).

J. Layte

On Mon, Nov 22, 2010 at 6:48 PM, 13782

<Christopher.STRICKLAND@devonandcornwall.pnn.police.uk> wrote:

Mr LAYTE

I have supplied the DVD to our Force legal and will forward this email to them.

I will be in contact with you by the end of the week.

C. Strickland

From: john layte [mailto:johnlayte@googlemail.com]
Sent: 20 November 2010 16:57
To: STRICKLAND Christopher 13782
Cc: johnlayte@hotmail.com; Police Authority Office
Subject: Your 17 November 2010 letter.

Goonhillend Cottage Goongumpas Redruth Cornwall TR16 5JL

01209 820146 johnlayte@googlemail.com

D.I. Strickland
Devon & Cornwall Constabulary
Truro Police Station
Tregolls Rd
TRURO
Cornwall TR1 1PY

20 November 2010

Complaint against Mr DJ Arthur

Dear DI Strickland

Thank you for your letter of 17 November 2010 (copy attached).

Although you state our complaint against Mr Arthur "*obviously relates to a long term ongoing civil matter*" it is not true to say the civil matter is ongoing. Mr Arthur's Claim was decided at the final trial of his Claim in November 2005. Mr Arthur asked for permission to appeal the the Order but permission was refused on 8 May 2006. That marked the end of the litigation and the "civil matter" has been ***Res judicata*** from that date. We were, by the Court Order dated 24 November 2005, awarded costs against Mr Arthur and have been told, by a Judge, it is our right to receive them. Mr Arthur has (so far) avoided paying our costs (which are considerable), by a succession of lies and providing the Court with a bill of costs which bore little resemblance to the bills we served him with. We maintain that is attempting to pervert the course of justice which is a criminal matter and not a civil one.

It is true Mr Arthur has made several threats of civil action since the conclusion of his claim (the latest threat attached) but since he has not instigated any of them there is currently no "ongoing civil matter" in the Justice system. My wife and I consider these threats of litigation to be harassment which again could be a criminal matter.

I would be grateful if you would forward this e-mail and its attachments to your Force Legal Department so that they are aware of these facts.

You say you have forwarded the "paperwork" to your Force Legal Department but most of the material we supplied you with was contained on a DVD. Please confirm you have also supplied them with a copy of this.

Yours Sincerely

JH Layte

Devon & Cornwall Police aims to serve the communities of Devon & Cornwall and help inspire greater confidence in the Police. For more information please visit our website at www.devon-cornwall.police.uk

This e-mail is intended for the named individual(s) only and may contain information which is protected in law. If you have received this e-mail in error, you may not read, copy, disseminate or otherwise deal with it. In this case, please delete the e-mail and contact the sender immediately.

Internet e-mail is not secure. Therefore Devon & Cornwall Police does not accept legal responsibility for the contents or distribution of this message including file attachments. Any views or opinions presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Devon & Cornwall Police. All reasonable efforts have been made to check that any attached software or other material is/are free of computer viruses, but Devon & Cornwall Police accepts no responsibility for any damage, howsoever arising, as a result of their transmission to the recipient's computer or network.

No virus found in this message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 2013.0.2805 / Virus Database: 2637/6021 - Release Date: 01/09/13

— Attachments: —

17nov2010fromstrickland.PDF	249 kB
21dec2012tosimms with links.pdf	192 kB
Strickland 22 Nov reply to 20 Nov 2010 email.eml	283 kB
strickland17nov2010.PDF	32.4 kB
28 Oct 2010 d arthur.PDF	160 kB